



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. V

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 23, 1911

No. 10

In a volume entitled *Literature and the American College* (Houghton Mifflin Co., 1908: 263 pages) Professor Irving Babbitt of Harvard University presents a collection of nine essays, most of which are of interest to friends of the Classics.

In the first essay (1-31) he seeks to define humanism. Humanism and humanitarianism have long been confused, certainly ever since the days of Aulus Gellius (see *Noctes Atticae* 13, 17). One evidence of that confusion is the practice, all too common, says our author, of citing Terence's famous verse,

Homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto,

as if it were an utterance of humanism; humanitarianism, not humanism, is voiced in these words. On this chapter, however, there is not space to dwell now. Nor can we consider Chapter II Two Types of Humanitarians. Bacon and Rousseau (32-71), III The College and the Democratic Spirit (72-87), IV Literature and the College (88-117), V Literature and the Doctor's Degree (118-149). Attention must be confined to Chapter VI, which deals with The Rational Study of the Classics (150-180).

Throughout his book Professor Babbitt writes as a candid friend of the Classics, who believes that their adherents and teachers need admonition at many points if they are to do their best for classical studies and for America. In this chapter he begins by admitting freely the immense importance for American education of the establishment of the graduate school at Johns Hopkins, and its successors. He points out, however, the dangers of the sort of training given in such schools, especially the evil results of bestowing too much time and energy on the study of minutiae.

There are persons at present who do not believe that a man is fitted to fill a chair of French literature in an American college simply because he has made a critical study of the text of a dozen mediaeval beast fables and written a thesis on the Picard dialect, and who deny that a man is necessarily qualified to interpret the humanities to American undergraduates because he has composed a dissertation on the use of the present participle in Ammianus Marcellinus.

Germany, the author holds, has put too much faith in intellectual appliances, and is perhaps beginning to show signs of a decadence similar to that which overtook Greek science in the schools of Alexandria. As the field of ancient literature is more and more

completely covered, the vision of the special investigator, he adds, must become more and more microscopic. On the fallacious notion that there is little or nothing to do in Classics something was said in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2.1-2. As a possible means of offsetting the dangers of minute study in a very limited field the author proposes examinations

similar in character, perhaps, to those now held for honors at Oxford and Cambridge—examinations which would touch upon ancient life and literature at the largest possible number of points, and which might serve to reveal, as the writing of a doctor's thesis does not, the range as well as the exactness of a student's knowledge. Some test is certainly needed which shall go to show the general culture of a candidate as well as his special proficiency, his familiarity with ideas as well as with words, and his mastery of the spirit, as well as of the mechanism, of the ancient languages.

One who has taken part in the oral examination of candidates for the Doctorate can bear testimony to the truth of Mr. Babbitt's words. Our graduate students need, more than anything else, breadth of knowledge and sweep of vision, a general 'Uebersicht' of the classical field. In the last analysis, indeed, the individual student must in large measure gain that breadth of knowledge, that sweep of vision, that catholicity of sympathy, through his own unremitting toil and by the application of a faculty which Professor Babbitt elsewhere well labels "assimilative originality". This phrase, by the way, seems to me admirably to characterize the Romans, particularly in the field of literature (though our author entertains the conventional view, German in origin, as it happens, which belittles the originality of Latin literature). Yet more might well be done, in both collegiate and graduate curricula, to help the student toward these ends than is done in some cases now. The courses to be given in the graduate school in Greek and Latin should not be determined entirely by the predilections of individual instructors; by that process we shall have a graduate curriculum made up of isolated specialties and hobbies, and will lack that definite beginning, middle and end which, to Aristotle's mind, should characterize all things of consequence. Rather there should lie back of both college and graduate curricula a definite well-ordered scheme, based on careful reflection, as a result of which the courses shall be in the main, parts of a whole. This can be done without stifling in any way

the spirit of research or preventing the insertion of some courses in each year which are the fruit of individual bent among the instructors.

There is very much in the rest of the chapter that would bear quoting in full. But only one more passage can in fact be presented here; it is hoped that the purpose of this editorial has been attained, and that attention has at last been called to a book which should have been discussed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* long ago.

There is, to be sure, a very real danger in some subjects, especially in English literature, that the instruction may take too belletristic a turn. The term 'culture course' has come to mean, among the undergraduates of one of our Eastern colleges, a course in which the students are not required to do any work. It is one of the main advantages of Latin and Greek over modern languages that the mere mastering of an ancient author's meaning will give enough bone and sinew of solid intellectual effort to justify the teacher in adding thereto the flesh and blood of a literary interpretation. In a civilization so hard and positive in temper as our own, it is not the instinct for philology, but rather the instinct for literature and for the things of the imagination which is likely to remain latent if left to itself. A certain dry, lexicographical habit of mind is said by Europeans to be the distinctive mark of American scholarship. Instead of fostering this habit of mind in the study of the Classics by an undue insistence on philology, it should be our endeavor to counteract it by giving abundant stimulus and encouragement to the study of them as literature. In the Classics more than in other subjects, the fact should never be forgotten that the aim proposed is the assimilation, and not the accumulation of knowledge. In the Classics, if nowhere else, mere erudition should be held in comparatively little account except in so far as it has been converted into culture; and culture itself should not be regarded as complete until it has so penetrated its possessor as to become part of his character. C. K.

A GREEK CITY (PRIENE) RECONSTRUCTED¹

Teachers of the Classics are always ready to welcome publications that put into their hands fresh means of illustrating ancient life. Appeals to the eye of the pupil are important aids toward vivifying instruction and deepening impressions made by the printed text and the words of the teacher. German scholars have long been leaders in the work of preparing illustrative material. The colored lithograph of the reconstruction of an entire Hellenistic city, recently published, carefully worked out upon the basis of data furnished by expert research among

the remains, ought to take an important place in class-room equipment. The lithograph of Priene (36x39 inches, conveniently mounted and rolled) presents a splendid pictorial summary of the results achieved by the excavators. Any summary of a large work must necessarily omit much of important detail, and so the reconstruction cannot show all the rich results of the excavations. But it does afford an excellent general view, with no little detail, of what Priene must have looked like in the days of its prosperity. In spite of certain crudities in coloring, the effect of the whole is pleasing to the eye. The essay of Wiegand which accompanies the lithograph is a competent guide through the city, giving details of municipal and domestic arrangements such as could not be shown in the picture. It may serve the teacher at the same time as an example worth imitating of accurate, yet lively interpretation of antique life, such as appeals to students.

To classical teachers the excavations at Priene are of special interest for two reasons: they have given us an unique example of the method by which a Greek city was built in the time of Alexander the Great, and they have uncovered the remains of great numbers of private houses of a type little understood before.

When the founders of Priene searched the region of the Maeander valley for a suitable site for their new city, they found, in the heart of the Mykale range, in a place rich in mountain springs, a lone rock promontory facing the south, which lent itself readily to fortification. Here they had an Akropolis ready at hand and a pure water supply—the two essentials for a city. About the Akropolis and the terraced rocks at its base they drew a wall of fifteen (15) stadia. Before the construction of a single permanent public building was begun a plan of the entire city was constructed and a survey made according to this plan. It called for a regular system of streets intersecting at right angles and at equal intervals, with the Agora as the center of the whole system. All public buildings were subsequently built to fit this plan. The lithograph of Zippelius shows how the plan was strictly carried out by the engineers, in spite of great difficulties.

From the height of the Akropolis, which is bare of structures save the wall of defense, a dizzy path leads down into the city. Near the foot of the Akropolis, just within the Eastern wall and outside the residence quarter, stands a water reservoir. From this the water supply, brought down from the heights above, was distributed to all parts of the city and into the houses by water mains and small pipes of terra-cotta. On approximately the same level with this reservoir, and on the right of any one descending the Akropolis path is the sanctuary of Demeter. Just below this point the path

¹In this brief paper, written at the request of the editors of *The Classical Weekly*, there is no effort at originality. I have sought merely to call attention to the recently published colored lithograph which gives an excellent bird's-eye view of Priene as reconstructed by competent authorities and to the essay explanatory of the lithograph. Throughout the paper I have had in mind two publications of Teubner (Leipzig, 1910), as follows: Priene, nach den Ergebnissen der Ausgrabungen der Preussischen Museen 1895-1898 rekonstruiert von Ad. Zippelius, aquarelliert von E. Wolfesfeld; Priene, ein Begleitwort zur Rekonstruktion von A. Zippelius, von Theodor Wiegand, mit 18 Figuren im Text und 5 Tafeln (reprint from *Neue Jahrb.* XXV). Mk. 9.